

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 11-15 are amended. Claim 10 is cancelled, and new claims 16-17 are added. Claims 1-9 and 11-17 are pending and under consideration.

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendment and light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

The form PTO-1449 accompanying the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed November 17, 2000 indicates that translations of the "Abst" (i.e., the Abstracts) were submitted with each corresponding Japanese patent application submitted with the IDS. The relevant portions of the Japanese references are the Abstracts. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted the requirements of the MPEP have been met, and it is respectfully requested consideration of the previously submitted Japanese patent applications and English Abstracts be acknowledged in the next Office Action.

Drawings

Regarding to the objection to Figure 10, a replacement drawing sheet is submitted in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Specification

Regarding the objection to the specification, the specification is also amended in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action and to correct minor informalities. No new matter is added because one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the changes are necessary. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection also be withdrawn.

Objection to Claims 6 and 14

Regarding the objection to claims 6 and 14, these claims are amended in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action. Claim 6 is amended to depend on claim 2, and claim 14 is amended to recite "The method" instead of "The system". Accordingly, it is respectfully requested the objection to claims 6 and 14 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC § 112

Claims 4-8 and 14 were rejected under 35 § 112, second paragraph as indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4-6 and 14 are amended to include generic terminology in lieu of the trademarks JAVA and CORBA, in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-11 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as indefinite. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 is amended to recite "...updating the applet at the terminal unit to the latest version..." to clarify where the applet is updated, in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action. Claims 13 and 15 are similarly amended. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-9 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent number 6,360,366 to Heath. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a system including "a central office server of a banking institution" and "a branch office terminal unit of the banking institution," in which an applet is stored having a single-program structure (support for which is found in the originally filed specification at least at page 17, lines 14-20 and at page 2, line 20 to page 3, line 2). In this way, each applet completes its own version management independently from other applets.

Moreover, independent claim 1 includes features of "storing local version number information about the applet" at the branch office terminal unit, in which the local version number of the applet is compared to the version number read from the central office server "when a predetermined event occurs." Independent claims 2, 3, 13 and 15 include similar features.

As an advantage, each applet performs version management independently from other applets in a banking system. Further, because version management is completed by each applet, it is not necessary for the branch office terminal unit to store in advance a catalog of details regarding versions of applets and components. As a result, the speed of applet updating increases.

In contrast, Heath only discusses "maintaining a catalog of components with the version identifications" of application programs (col. 1, lines 62-66), in which "the catalog file" is "retained on the client..." (col. 2, lines 31-35).

Accordingly, Heath does not teach or suggest at least reading a version number of an applet at a central office server and "comparing the read version number with the local version number" of the applet "when a predetermined event occurs," as in the independent claims.

Moreover, Heath only discusses "a personal computer or a workstation that operates on a network to execute various application programs" and a "centralized computer on the network which services the clients..." (col.1, lines 14-19), but does not teach or suggest "a central office server of a banking institution" nor "a branch office terminal unit of the banking institution" as in the independent claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1-3, 13 and 15 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Heath.

Claim 10 was also rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Heath. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claims 1-3, 13 and 15 are amended to include similar features as claim 10, and claim 10 is accordingly canceled. Further, it is respectfully submitted a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made because there is no motivation to modify Heath in the manner suggested in item 14 of the outstanding office action.

In particular, Heath discusses at col. 8, lines 7-45 that "the client is a world wide web (web) client, such as a web browser, and the automatic version upgrading process is implemented to run fully within such a browser." However, such a system differs from a system including a central office server of a banking institution and a branch office terminal unit of the banking institution, as in the independent claims. Moreover, although item 14 of the outstanding Office Action asserts that "it is well known that client / server networks are used in all type of business, including banking," there is no motivation or suggestion to modify Heath in the manner suggested in the outstanding Office Action.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made, and it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims 16 and 17

In addition, new claims 16 and 17 are added to set forth the invention in a varying scope. New claim 16 is similar to claim 1, but also includes features of an applet performing version management independently, in which the terminal unit does not store in advance information of versions of applets (support for which is found in the originally filed specification at least at page 6, line 24 to page 7, line 3 and in FIG. 4). Further, new claim 16 is believed to be allowable at least for similar reasons as claim 1, and also because Heath does not teach or suggest the additional features of new claim 16.

Also, new claim 17 is similar to claim 12, but depends on claim 6. It is believed no new matter is added, and new claim 17 is believed to be allowable at least for similar reasons as claims 3 and 6 from which claim 17 depends.

Conclusion

In light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 24, 2004

By: Ryan Rafferty
Ryan Rafferty
Registration No. 55,556

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 454-1589
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501